

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/779,678	02/18/2004	Shigeki Kato	118665	8558	
25944 75	90 04/14/2005		EXAMINER		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			MAHONEY, CHRISTOPHER E		
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2851		
			DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary		10/779,678	KATO ET AL.		(Ken)			
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Christopher E. Mahoney	2851		-			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress				
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	nety filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 F	ebruary 2005.						
2a)🛛	This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.						
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 February 2004</u> is/ar Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The specific and the spe	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objecte drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Set tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 Cl	FR 1.121(d)).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document copies of the priority document copies of the priority document copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea see the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Application Thirty documents have been receive U (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage				
2)	et(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) ser No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	O-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada (U.S. Patent No. 5,548,350). Yamada teaches a rear projector comprising a housing that has a front side thereof defined by an opening edge portion (defined by 2 for example), a screen panel 1 that is slightly larger than the opening of the housing and attached to the front side of the housing such that the opening edge portion of the opening and a periphery of the screen are opposed to each other (figures 4b, 4c) the screen panel receiving projection light from a rear side (col. 1, lines 9-10) by a video projector within the housing (col. 2, lines 4-7). A dust proofing elastic member 5 is disposed between the periphery of the screen panel and the opening edge portion. The screen panel is attached to the housing. The dust proofing elastic member is formed of a closed cell expanded resin (col. 6, lines 48-62). The applicant is directed to review figures 4b-4c, col. 5, lines 50-51, 64-67, as well as col. 6, lines 1-12, 21-29, 34-36, and 48-67.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 24, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that Yamada does not teach the claimed invention because the screen is not directly attached to the housing. First the examiner would like to point out that the claim language does not recite that the screen is directly attached to the housing. The second part of the applicant's argument is that the screen of Yamada is mounted in framework (and not housing) which is then connected to the housing. The housing of Yamada is comprised of framework 2 and cabinet 3. The applicant's claims do not require a one piece housing.

Should the applicant choose to amend the claims to recite a one piece housing, the applicant should keep in mind that it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

The applicant discusses the connection between framework 2 and cabinet 3 and states. that Yamada does not teach a dust proof member and that dust may get in between 2 and 3. First, the dust proof member claimed by the applicant is designed to prevent dust from getting into the apparatus through the defined opening, not from the side. Second the applicant is not claiming or disclosed that the entire housing is airtight. The examiner is unclear and therefore requesting information. Is the applicant's invention supposed to be completely air tight (i.e. without vent holes anywhere)? If this is a requirement for the invention, the applicant is respectfully requested to indicate where this is taught in the specification so that the public may be given both notice and the benefit of that knowledge. Third, the applicant has not provided a statement and

supporting evidence that dust will definitively get in the interlock between framework 2 and cabinet 3. Alleging a possibility is purely speculative.

The applicant further argues that Yamada does not teach a closed cell expanded resin.

While Yamada does not explicitly recite the term closed cell expanded resin, it is the examiner's position that a closed cell expanded resin is an elastic plastic foam (as disclosed in col. 6, lines 56-59) which can be made from an assortment of materials including the materials discussed in col. 6. If the applicant persists in the position that Yamada does not teach a closed cell expanded resin, the applicant is requested to point out in the application specification the definition/explanation of a closed cell expanded resin (sponge) and distinguish that definition/explanation from what is disclosed in the Yamada reference.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/779,678

Art Unit: 2851

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher E. Mahoney whose telephone number is (571) 272-2122. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5PM, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher E Mahoney

Page 5

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2851